

body is that there have been a number of conflicting statements made to both myself, and I think to Senator Stoney and perhaps to some other people who have taken the opportunity to look into this matter. I would like to have the matter set at ease in my own mind. I would appreciate more time to look into this matter and that is why I requested that it be bracketed for a period of 21 days. I would ask for unanimous consent.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: You are asking for unanimous consent to bracket it for how many days?

SENATOR SIMON: I believe 21. This is the first of March and I asked that it be bracketed until the 21st sir.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Alright, is there an objection? There are several objections.

SENATOR SIMON: Well then I would just ask for a vote on that.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Alright, you are moving to bracket LB22 until March 21st. Alright speaking to that motion now. Senator Swigart first, then Senator Kelly and then Senator Lewis.

SENATOR SWIGART: Mr. Chairman, I don't see a need now friends to have this laid over. Because we have a revealing amendment that works out all of the opposition. I don't think that there is any reason to hold it over. I wish that we could hear it with the proposal that we now have. I have been working with Mr. Stoney and all of those who opposed the bill and have it worked out. As soon as I can I would like to discuss this proposal. So, I would like to object to the hold-over because I think that we ought to get it moving. There is no reason to hold it now.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman I'm going to take a very unpopular position and I don't care. Because the problems to come are going to so burden this legislature that you are going to wish that you never made this kind of an approach. Each of us know that in an advocacy position for a particular handicap that there is concern and apprehension in terms of what you write into law. I would invite you that if you are concerned about a child getting an adequate program that you look at 94-142 from the federal government. Look at 94-503. I have got the same kind of mail that you got. I got the same kind of phone calls that you have. But, it is substantially wrong to write in methodology of teaching of handicapped education into law. You are going to create a problem that you don't even know about right now. There are 106 others that are going to be right here with us and then you are going to prescribe the method for teaching learning disability. You are going to prescribe the method for teaching multiple handicapped. You are going to prescribe the method for TMR, you are going to write all of that into statutes and you are going to create more chaos than we have had in special education for the last two years and that is enough to last me a life time. I just as soon belly up to the issue right now, and say that instructional methods is not a part of statute. We have delegated the responsibility for instruction to a particular body, and we have an appeals process. We have the federal laws that demand that we do